Meeting Summary Report

Background

The Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) has invited 15 representatives of the hard crab fishery, peeler fishery, and wholesale dealers to serve as members of an ad hoc Blue Crab Advisory Board (BCAB). The advisory board is designed to bring together a group of industry representatives from around the state who represent a diversity of commercial blue crab stakeholders and who can provide constructive comments and guidance to FWC on the development of the blue crab management program. From September 2003 through January 2004, the advisory board will meet four times in one or two-day meetings to focus on reviewing and discussing blue crab fishery issues and the development of a state effort management program for the commercial blue crab fishery.

During the initial meeting of the Blue Crab Advisory Board on September 23-24, 2003, members worked through a process to develop goal statements and then identify possible key objectives or operational issues to be addressed in each goal area. During the second meeting on October 30, members reviewed, discussed and refined an initial set of draft objectives. The facilitators redrafted the objectives based on member comments for this, the third meeting. The initial acceptability rankings and member comments from the pre-meeting survey were compiled into worksheets used by the facilitators to guide discussion on October 30. During the meeting members reviewed, discussed and refined the draft goals and objectives. (The letters and numbers assigned to the draft goals and objectives are not intended to indicate any prioritization and are used only to identify items for purposes of discussion.)

Welcome and Introductions
Bill Teehan, Fisheries Management Analyst, welcomed members to the third meeting of the BCAB and stressed the value of the members’ participation and input into the development of a state management program for the blue crab fishery. Facilitator Jeff Blair from the Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium reviewed the meeting objectives and agenda, the meeting guidelines, and the consensus-building guidelines (meeting agenda packet available through http://consensus.fsu.edu/ or upon request) and sunshine law guidelines (see appendix A).

Agenda Review and Approval
The Board voted unanimously, 12 - 0 in favor, to approve the agenda as presented including the following objectives.
Approval of October 30, 2003 Facilitators’ Summary Report
The Board voted unanimously, 12 - 0 in favor, to approve the October 30, 2003 Facilitator’s Report as presented.

Approval of New Board Member
The Board voted unanimously, 12 - 0 in favor, to approve replacing Dennis David with Roy Williams to serve as the Agency’s representative to the Board.

Review and Discussion of Draft Objectives
At the board members’ request, the facilitators and staff used input offered by members during the October meeting to redraft an initial set of objectives and reorganized them into worksheets for Management Plan Issues and Non-Management Plan Issues. Members agreed that the focus of this meeting should be on providing the agency with guidance in developing a management plan for the Blued Crab industry and to postpone the discussion and refinement of non-management plan issues until a future meeting.

The facilitators utilized the worksheets to guide members through the meeting discussion. Members discussed each draft objective under the management plan issues and, when necessary, offered refinements to address any concerns and build consensus support. Facilitators initially used the following four-point scale to test member consensus on refinements to the objectives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Acceptability Scale</th>
<th>4 = acceptable I agree</th>
<th>3 = acceptable, I agree with minor reservations</th>
<th>2 = not acceptable, I don’t agree unless major reservations addressed</th>
<th>1 = not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

During the meeting, the facilitators also used a yes or no straw poll to test for member support of suggested refinements to the draft objectives. In addition, the review of some of the goals and draft objectives was deferred until the next meeting.

The following are the redrafted objectives reviewed by the members. Each draft objective is followed by an acceptability ranking based on revisions (where applicable) and a list of comments and suggestions offered by members during an initial review on day one and a follow up review during the morning of day two. The italicized comments are the action taken and or the proposed revision that members indicated support for through the acceptability ranking.

The letters and numbers assigned to the draft goals and objectives in the worksheets are not intended to indicate any prioritization and are used only to identify items for purposes of discussion.

It should be noted that all of the original, and several new, objectives were reviewed and reconsidered, including those objectives which members did not initially support. At the conclusion of day two, all of the objectives related to management plan issues had been considered and consensus ranked for acceptability.
I. MANAGEMENT PLAN ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Goal A: Regulation/ Management
Promote and support a healthy and profitable blue crab industry through management and regulation.

Effort Management:

1. Develop a range of alternatives for limited entry/effort management to reduce effort in the fishery through multiple means and combinations.
   
   **Acceptability Ranking:**
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec. Meeting</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Member Comments, Dec. 3rd-4th:
   - No changes

2. Develop criteria for qualifying to participate in the fishery that are appropriate for the industry and emphasis experience.
   
   **Acceptability Ranking:**
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Member Comments, Dec. 3rd-4th:
   - No changes

3. Extend the moratorium to establish a cap on participation in the fishery until a management plan is established.
   - No changes

   **Acceptability Ranking:**
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Member Comments, Dec. 3rd-4th:
   - No changes

4. Require recreational harvesters in the fishery to mark their bouys and traps with their name and address and allow a maximum of five traps per boat without charging a fee.
   
   **Acceptability Ranking:**
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Member Comments, Dec. 3rd-4th:
New Objective from December 2003 meeting:
*Require FL # on buoys for recreational harvesters.
*(Unsure if this is instead of or in addition to #4 above, suspect in addition)

Acceptability Ranking:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2=major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Not a problem with recreational harvesters in certain areas
- Will prevent recreational harvesters from using 25 traps by putting five people on a boat

5. Evaluate and develop recommendations for eliminating the loopholes to circumvent the moratorium or management plan.

Acceptability Ranking:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2=major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible Recommendations (from October meeting) to consider under the revised objective:
- Person that holds the license is responsible or accountable
- Limit to five the number of boats that any one individual can endorse
- I am against limiting the number of traps. We should consider limits on the number of boats if we do not limit the number of traps. We should look at the connection between the number of boats endorsed and any limit on number of traps

Member Comments, Dec. 3rd-4th:
- What is the number of total crabbers compared to total traps?
- Economics vs. effort
- Crabbing is coming back
- How many can we have vs. how many can we fish?
- People will inflate trap numbers on surveys
- Data reports are not necessarily reflecting reality
- What about traps on the hill? If you say 500, state will make it 200
- Everybody gets 500 if they have landings
- Need to fish at least 200 traps; if crabber wants to go to different areas they need more traps; at least 600
- Make it 1000; already have 1500 on one endorsement
- Crabbers will not support 600 traps
- Regional crabbers may not even use 500 traps; perhaps develop trap numbers by region
- Buy a license, can deploy 500; can have as many on hill as you want; will solve effort problems…..must deal with
- 500 = 9
- 600 = 12
- Trap number is place holder, the staff will develop actual numbers for next meeting
- What about new entrants?
- Will have to be some method to pass endorsements on
- Will set number make harvesters use more than they normally would?
- Responded with traps per day, not traps owned
In New York, SPL holders immediate family automatically could get a license
There are methods to address family transfer

**New Objective from December 2003 meeting:**
600 (650 for cleaning purposes) hard crab traps per license/endorsement in inshore waters deployed at one time, must be based on at least 500 pounds landings during any one year of a three year period; license is transferable.

Acceptability Ranking:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptability Ranking</th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New Objective from December 2003 meeting:**
400 (450 for cleaning purposes) peeler crab traps license/endorsement in inshore waters deployed at one time, must be based on at least 250 peeler crabs during any one year of a three year period; license is transferable.

Acceptability Ranking:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptability Ranking</th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Establish blue crab sanctuaries or no-harvest zones to protect blue crab spawning and nursery grounds. (from memorandum)

Acceptability Ranking:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptability Ranking</th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member Comments, Dec. 3rd-4th:
- Gus Muench; Little Manatee area needs sanctuary because too many traps are deployed; tendency to catch all crabs in certain areas
- This question will come up again, we should discuss
- Set a depth for sanctuary, i.e. 10 meters -
- Economics dictate when crabs are caught
- Minor run in fall, major run in spring
- Staff will develop map with 10 meter contour compared with 9 miles
- Already have sanctuary because of prohibition in federal waters –
- Peace River is federal waters
- Federal waters? Or just federal species management?
- Don’t crab in shallow waters (less than 3 feet) so those are already a sanctuary
- Supply and demand dictates harvest therefore there are sanctuaries when no harvest
- Females travel to offshore waters to spawn
- Establishing sanctuaries will open door for further restrictions

* Staff will bring back maps and information to aid members in discussing the issue of sanctuaries further at the next meeting.
* Members agreed to re-evaluate objective #6 (sanctuaries) at the January 2004 meeting.
7. Reduce effort in the fishery by either trap reduction or by limiting the number of traps an individual may have.

Acceptability Ranking:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2=major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member Comments, Dec. 3rd-4th:
- *Already discussed and covered under #5*

8. No size limits on peelers.

Acceptability Ranking:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2=major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member Comments, Dec. 3rd-4th:
- Why would you not want a size limit
- Peelers are different sizes at different times of the year
- Peelers will not grow after last shed
- Size limit will mean enforcement effort will go through boxes of crabs to measure and injure the crabs
- There is a market for all sizes; most sell jumbos, hotels, and whales

*Unanimous - no action should be taken to put size limits on peelers*

Acceptability Ranking:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2=major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Refined recommendation from December 2003 meeting:**

9. Close harvesting season on a region by region basis for a one (1) week limited time period for the purpose of identifying and removing derelict traps from the water.

Acceptability Ranking:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2=major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member Comments, Dec. 3rd-4th:
- One week
- 2nd week of December
- Not the same time in every region

*Board members will poll local harvesters to determine the best times to close for each region to close for a one week period.*
Members will offer a proposed regional closing time period at the January 2004 meeting.

10. Do not establish a prohibition on the harvest of female crabs.

Acceptability Ranking:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member Comments, Dec. 3\textsuperscript{rd}-4\textsuperscript{th}:
- No changes

11. (Formerly #1 under category “Traps”) Do not require trap tags similar to the spiny lobster and stone crab fisheries.

Acceptability Ranking:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec. initial</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. revised</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member Comments, Dec. 3\textsuperscript{rd}-4\textsuperscript{th}:
- Continuously bring traps in for maintenance; how do we switch tags
- Lobster and stone crab have closed seasons
- How can trap numbers be enforced if not by tags
- Must consider trap lose in use of tags; must pay for lobster and stone crab tags
- Must consider an enforcement consideration
- Limit boats instead of traps therefore no tag issue
- Attach tag to line instead of trap
- Officer will pull trap to check traps
- Tags will generate money for fishery
- Why do we need tags?
- Amount of fee is important, needs to be worked out

New objective from December 2003 meeting.
Allow 650 tags per license in order to provide for the ability to rotate 50 traps for cleaning.
Unanimous support see revised ranking above.

Key questions to consider and clarify under effort management:
(The following questions were offered together by the facilitators in order to clarify key issues under effort management)

A. Should a management plan limit to five the number of boats any one individual can endorse?
B. Should a management plan include limits on the number of traps based either on landings or on a per boat basis?
C. Should a management plan include a connection between the number of boats endorsed and any limit on the number of traps?)
Member Comments on Dec. 3rd:
- If you limit traps then you don’t need to limit endorsements
- If you don’t limit both you are not capping effort
- Limiting number of boats will solve the problem
- One boat can only pull so many traps per day
- One vessel is licensed, not trap limit
- Vessel and individual license allows two boats
- Prefer boats to tags –Straw poll: 3 support, 10 against

Licenses

1. Establish separate licenses/regulations, for the soft and hard shell crab fisheries.

   Acceptability Ranking:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2=major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Member Comments, December 3rd:
   - Already discussed and covered in objectives above

2. A license or endorsement may be transferred to another vessel on a temporary basis for holders use or to cover sickness or breakdown, but not transferred to another boat to allow someone else to fish under the holder’s license or endorsement.

   Acceptability Ranking:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2=major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Member Comments, Dec. 3rd-4th:
   - No changes

Traps/Gear

1. (Moved above to #11 under “Effort Management”)

2. Allow degradable staples or hog rings for the degradable panel requirements for traps. This is in addition to other approved methods.

   Acceptability Ranking:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2=major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Member Comments, Dec. 3rd-4th:
   - No changes.
3. **Allow bait to be placed in the peeler trap to feed the jimmie crab.** (from memorandum)

   *Acceptability Ranking:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   **Member Comments, Dec. 3rd-4th:**
   - No changes

4. **Do not re-evaluate gear specifications, e.g. trap size, degradable materials.**

   *Acceptability Ranking:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   **Member Comments, Dec. 3rd-4th:**
   - Number of escape rings should be one at top of the trap
   - Had escape rings before it was law, but only had one, vertical
   - Already have size limit
   - Two parts of trap, where they come in, and where they are trapped; put ring in trap area
   - Every hole cut in a trap weakens the trap
   - Need to see research

   **New objective from December 2003 meeting:**
   Reduce escape ring size requirements to a minimum of 2- 5/16”. Allow only 1 escape ring, to be located on a vertical surface near the top of the trap.

   ☀ **Staff will research size and number**

   *Acceptability Ranking:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
   - 1 minor reservation pending research
   - May need to consider by region

5. **Allow Consider vertical or horizontal degradable panels in traps.**

   *Acceptability Ranking:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   **Member Comments, Dec. 3rd-4th:**
   - Revised language above clarifies that you can use either
   - No changes
6. Evaluate rope types and materials to reduce the amount of floating buoy line in the water.

Acceptability Ranking:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec 3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member Comments, Dec. 3rd-4th:

No changes – delete from recommendations

7. Establish a minimum five-inch by five-inch buoy size for markers.

Acceptability Ranking:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member Comments, Dec. 3rd-4th:

New objective from December 2003 meeting:
Allow for use of alternate buoy types, size: minimum 5” diameter, minimum 5” length.

Acceptability Ranking:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Minimum 5” diameter with sufficient length to display v#
- Standard cork can be 5 _ inches

8. (Originally #3 under “Trap Management” in Goal D) Allow degradable staples or hog rings for the degradable panel requirements for traps.

Acceptability Ranking:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member Comments, Dec. 3rd-4th:
- Don’t want to exclude existing materials

Goal B: Licensing and Fees
Develop a licensing system that promotes a healthy and profitable BCI

License Fees and Variances

1. (Moved to Non-Management Issues, Goal B, as related to recommendation to DACS)
2. Cap the number of licenses and allow access into the fishery when a license holder sells or gives up his/her license.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2=major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member Comments, Dec. 3rd-4th:
- Will there be different limitations on peeler and hard
- For those who are soft shell producers, threshold is 250 crabs
- Qualifying during any one of three years
- Can’t catch peelers without catching hard crabs, therefore just use 500 pounds hard crabs
- Must catch jimmies and end up selling them after no longer useful
- Use 500 pounds of crabs for everyone
- Trying to separate peelers fishery from hard crab fishery…two different licenses therefore two different qualifying criteria

* Staff will bring info on number of SPLs with greater than 500 pounds to determine universe and help members discuss the issue further at the next meeting

3. Require "part-timers" pay an increased fee if their income from all fishing is less than 51% of their total income and/or have less than $5,000 in blue crab landings in the last three years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2=major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>13 to delete</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member Comments, Dec. 3rd-4th:
- 51% criteria is illegal

* Board voted unanimously to Delete this objective.

Refined recommendation from December 2003 meeting:
4. Establish an industry advisory board by agency rule, to develop recommendations on issues of interest and affecting the blue crab industry. a review board to evaluate distribution and use of fees from the industry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2=major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member Comments, Dec. 3rd-4th:
- Support a industry board that can look at all issues affecting the industry, not just limited use of fees
- Can establish an industry advisory board in rule – 13 in favor
- What is source of funding into fishery?
Refined recommendation from December 2003 meeting:
5. Support legislation to place/set a fee on V endorsements for the blue crab industry for fee increases on endorsement or V fee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member Comments, Dec. 3rd-4th:
- This is for vessel endorsement
- Lobster and stone crab have
- This is for V endorsement
- Set fee for V endorsement

Staff will look at some scenarios for fees and bring the information back to the next meeting for board review.

6. (Moved to Non-Management Plan, Goal B, since it is not under a management plan)

Members agreed the following suggestion is not a blue crab industry management plan issue, and not to make recommendations vis a vis recreational fishing.

A member offered the following additional suggestion for the Board to consider:
- Need to address the problem of red drum eating up young crabs. Consider raising the bag limit on red fish by sport fishermen

Education Through License System
Objective revised at the December 2003 meeting.
1. Require an orientation course and/or apprenticeship program for new entries on the rules, regulations and best practices in the blue crab industry before obtaining a blue crab endorsement for both hard shell and peeler endorsements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member Comments, Dec. 3rd-4th:
- Apprenticeship or education

2. Require apprenticeship program to develop level of competence before obtaining an endorsement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member Comments, Dec. 3rd-4th:
- See comments in objective above
- Combined with #1 above
3. Establish a restricted species endorsement for blue crabs that is based on blue crab landings only.

Member Comments, Dec. 3rd-4th:
- Members continued to support dropping this as a separate objective; the issue covered under another objective above

Evaluating Endorsements

1. Evaluate whether endorsements should be for the vessel or the individual.

Member Comments, Dec. 3rd-4th:
- Keep as either or

@ Members agreed to re-evaluate this objective at the January meeting pending staff research.

2. Allow endorsements to be transferable, if moving in or out of the industry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member Comments, Dec. 3rd-4th:
- Transfer and saleable to another individual; in and out

3. Establish a recreational blue crab stamp and use the fees that are collected to support the blue crab industry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>13 to delete</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member Comments, Dec. 3rd-4th:
- Establish a recreational endorsement

Don’t mess with recreational fishery – 13-0 in favor to delete this recommendation.
Goal D: Environmental Impacts
Industry promotes practices that result in good stewardship.

Derelict Traps and Enforcement

1. (Moved to Non-Management Issues, Goal D).

2. Require individuals who abandon twenty-five or more traps for more than thirty days to pay a penalty plus the cost of pulling the traps. Removal of the abandoned traps will be conducted by commercial fishers with notice to the FFWC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2=major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member Comments, Dec. 3rd-4th:
- Removal by commercial organizations only

Substitute: … conducted only by commercial organizations with notice …

Goal E: User Conflicts
Industry will lead efforts to resolve user conflict.

Education within and outside industry to limit possible conflicts

4. (Originally #5 under this heading) Prohibit the sale or shipping of peelers out of state.

New objective from December 2003 meeting:
Any crab under 5” leaving Florida must be in a soft shell state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2=major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member Comments, Dec. 3rd-4th:
- Cannot restrain interstate transport
- Lacey Act violation
- Sell to Florida dealer
- Require sale to wholesale dealer
- Undersized crabs being sold out of state needs to be stopped; no trip tickets, no reporting
- Enforcement issue
- The more dollars a crabber makes the less effort a crabber has to exert
- Transport in separate containers; time limit on how long crab out of the water
- Peelers are hard to identify; in the apprenticeship program include how to identify peelers
- People can get into fishery with no experience
- Revise objective: any undersized crabs leaving Florida must be in a soft shell state crabs
Define soft shell state – staff will bring back definition.

2. (Originally #6 under this heading) Regulate the peeler and soft shell industries separately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>December</th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member Comments, Dec. 3rd-4th:
- Allow hard crabbers to land soft crab by-catch
- Already a 100 peeler crab by-catch limit must be sold to licensed dealer
- License will get handle on people in tank houses,
- Must do soft shell all the way instead of catching peelers for sale
- Peelers must be sold to a licensed dealer, with FWC inspections
- Increase the by-catch allowance? i.e. 200
- 100 is enough, if you have a license then you can take more
- No $ made on soft shell crabs in Jacksonville, crabs going across the state line
- Lack of peeler landings may affect ability to get peeler license therefore by-catch allowance should be increased
- Once decision is made it is final
- If a crabber has hard crab endorsement then you will not be denied a peeler license
- Above would allow people who don’t understand peeler industry to get peeler license
- Above doesn’t accomplish the goal of effort management of peeler fishery
- Peeler industry success is driven by the experience of peeler operators
- Live crabs generate money in Florida, peelers generate money out of state
- Out of state peeler processors deployed traps in Florida, ship out of state for processing; causes too much effort in Florida waters; must be stopped through management
- Keep money in Florida; however, against further restrictions on Florida harvesters; therefore I support a 150-200 limit
- By increasing by-catch, then flood market, price is down
- 150 = 11, 100 = 2
- Peeler license/training, crabs sold to licensed dealer, verification, 150 by-catch allowed

New objective from December 2003 meeting:
Require a separate license for peeler crab operators, and establish criteria for Agency to use in order to evaluate that license holder is conducting a peeler operation from start to finish. Licensee must sell product to licensed dealers and must demonstrate competency. 150 crab by-catch is allowed for non-peeler license holders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>December</th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. (Originally #7 under this heading) Evaluate and address other possible conflicts between hard and soft crabbers.

Member Comments, Dec. 3rd-4th:
- No changes

Day One - Additional Issues and Concerns

Near the end of the first day, following an initial review of the management plan issues above, members identified and discussed the following issues:

1. Limit peeler traps to 400 in the water with 450 total available for use - 13 in favor
   - Member Comments:
     - Will not work 600 hard and 400 peeler traps at same time
     - In panhandle use same trap for peeler and hard crab

2. No limit on trap numbers in outside waters: 7 in favor, 4 minor, 0 major, 1 opposed
   - Member Comments:
     - ColRegs is not good - 1 mile offshore would be sufficient
     - One mile not good in Panhandle
     - Increase traps in offshore would not clog inland waterways
     - Regional
     - Don’t see the need for this
     - Inshore problem is congestion, not resource related, no congestion offshore
     - Offshore in panhandle has predator problem; therefore need more traps offshore
     - Southwest Tri-County license an effort to shift from out of area fishers
     - Staff will bring back recommendations for definition of offshore
     - Will cause conflict with stone crab management in Big bend
     - 600 offshore Big Bend area only

New objective from December 2003 meeting:
1000 traps allowed offshore statewide area only seaward of COLREGS (600 inshore, 400 offshore). Use different color tags to differentiate between inland and offshore use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>December</th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2=major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Offshore fishery in Sanibel, Everglades
- Different color tags
- 90% of offshore crabbing is in Big Bend
New objective from December 2003 meeting:
Make the two-week September blue crab closure apply to the entire gulf coast outside of three miles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2=major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Set tag fees at $.20 per tag
   Member comments:
   - Tag should be more
   - Revenue could be generated through trap transfers as an option, passive reduction
   - Must look at revenue sources for derelict trap removal

° Staff will evaluate funding and generate scenarios for Board review.

4. Leasing – 13 - 0 – against

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2=major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Member comments:
   - Will allow more effort
   - Need to consider immediate family

5. Vessel requirements
   Member comments:
   - 68E-27.022 needs to be applied uniformly
   - Deals with aft bulkhead in self-bailing boat

° Staff will get with enforcement to discuss

New objective from December 2003 meeting:
6. Peeler crab trap specs – 1” x 1” mesh required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2=major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Member comments:
   - Some use 1 _” mesh
   - Need to differentiate between the two traps
Day Two - Additional Issues and Concerns

After reviewing the management plan issues again at the beginning of day two, members offered and discussed the following comments and concerns about effort management issues:

Member Comments:
- Like idea of selling trap tags with passive reduction, e.g. stone crab
- Will have to reevaluate cap on traps as an effort plan to do this
- Number of traps will vary among fishers, therefore could sell surplus
- Finite number of 600, if fisher only wants 300, then that is the number he is left with?
- Sale of licenses without some restrictions will not accomplish the goal of effort management; it will allow individuals to increase the number of traps they fish without reducing the total number of traps
- Passive transfer will decrease traps in fishery
- Staff will address licensing at next meeting
- Goal is to reduce number of traps, can sell endorsements, transfer fees
- What difference does it make who owns the traps as long as the overall number is capped?
- If tags are sold, then there will be a disparity among fishers as to trap numbers
- Do we want to sell trap tags or manage the fishery?
- When the moratorium is lifted, there will be a flood of new entrants
- Reduction will occur when number goes to 600 since some fish more traps than that now
- Individual will submit an application sheet with number of tags desired
- Need to consider the issue of anyone cornering the market by buying up multiple licenses
- Remember the main goal is to reduce traps
- Can transfer by purchasing another license, to get one, you must by two i.e. nmfs snapper grouper program
- Above example won’t work in blue crab fishery
- Use July 1, 2003 as a control date – OFF
- If you buy a license, you buy the landings
- Or if buy license then have one year to qualify
- Multiple licenses will allow individual to have more than 600 traps
- Only way to add value to endorsement is to cap it now
- Page 9 #3 – restricted species endorsement for blue crab only
- Have to have 500 pounds within one of the last three years to qualify, therefore the issue is moot
- Individual with multiple endorsements will sell some off
- Control date includes a cut off for trip tickets to establish qualifying by landings
- People aren’t going to buy 1200 traps to get 600
- Reduce number of traps when you buy an endorsement
- Multiple endorsements have been around for years, why penalize them
- Set separate qualification for multiple endorsements

Issue of multiple endorsements – needs staff analysis – staff will offer scenarios for members to discuss at the next meeting.
Public Testimony
The facilitators asked if any members of the audience would like to offer comments to the board. Amos Dowley, fisherman on the Banana River, offered the following comments and concerns:

- Will you be fined for lost traps, replacement tags?
- 600 traps takes a crew
- Let little producer use fewer traps without qualification; that would allow retired fishers to continue to supplement their social security
- Vessel license will allow effort increase
- I do not want to see anyone have a monopoly
- 600 traps is enough for any individual
- With 250 traps, I made $125,000 in a good year
- Hardship considerations should be heard by an appeals board

Next Steps
Following the review and discussion of the management plan issues, the board members directed the staff to incorporate the suggested refinements and reorganize the draft objectives into a draft fisheries management plan for review at the next meeting.

The board members discussed and agreed the next meeting should be held over two days in Ocala, starting at 10:00 AM on Tuesday, January 6, and ending around noon on Wednesday, January 7. Staff will send members information about the meeting location and a hotel as soon as it is available.

The facilitators reminded members that they were representing other stakeholders and urged members to talk about the meetings and the materials with their respective constituencies prior to the next meeting. The meeting was then adjourned.

Staff Assignments for the January 2003 Meeting
- Develop a draft management plan based on members’ consensus recommendations with alternative scenarios on outstanding issues
- Arrange for DACS to do a presentation on marketing the seafood industry
- Arrange to present on manatee zone enforcement authority.
- Bring back maps and information to aid members in discussing the issue of sanctuaries.
- Research size and number issue for trap escape rings.
- Bring statistics on number of SPLs with greater than 500 pounds to determine universe.
- Review statistic and develop some scenarios for fees structures.
- Research vessel and individual endorsement statistics.
- Define soft shell state—propose/provide a definition.
- Evaluate funding and generate scenarios for tag and endorsement fees.
- Get with enforcement to discuss vehicle regulations—bring someone to meeting.
- Provide impact scenarios for multiple endorsements issue.

Adjourn
The Board voted unanimously, 13-0 in favor, to adjourn.
APPENDIX A

Sunshine Law Guidelines
(Section 286.011, Florida Statutes)

Applicability of Sunshine Law

1. Meetings of public boards or commissions must be open to the public;
2. Reasonable notice of such meetings must be given; and
3. Minutes of the meetings must be taken.

- Equally applicable to elected and appointed boards and applies to any gathering of two or more members of the same board to discuss some matter which will foreseeably come before that board for action.

- Written reports circulated among board members for comments.

- Telephone conversations and computer communication.

- Delegation of authority to a single individual.

- Use of nonmembers as liaisons between board members.

Issues not Subject to Sunshine Law Requirements

- Use of a written report by one member to inform other members of a subject which will be discussed at a public meeting, if prior to the meeting, there is no interaction related to the report among the members.

- Board members or designee may be authorized to gather information as a fact-finder only.

- Members may meet together socially, provided they refrain from discussing matters on which foreseeable action before the board are discussed.
# ATTACHMENT B

## MEETING EVALUATION RESULTS

**Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission**

**Blue Crab Advisory Board**

December 3 - 4, 2003

Ocala, Florida

### WERE THE MEETING OBJECTIVES MET?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>CIRCLE ONE</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overview of Agency and State Authority relative to manatee zone enforcement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine Law Overview</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refinement of recommended goals and objectives</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary agreement on draft management plan</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement on next steps for developing recommendations for a management plan</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MEETING ORGANIZATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>CIRCLE ONE</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background and agenda packet were helpful</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations were effective and informative</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plenary discussion format was effective</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small group discussion format was effective</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitators guided participant efforts effectively</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation was balanced</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What Did You Like Best About the Meeting?

- Good discussion
- Well organized
- Communication
- Got some real planning done
- Very well organized
- Everyone on the same page

What Could be Improved?

- Fine the way it is
- Nothing

COMMENT FORM

Please make your comment/s as specific as possible. Offer suggestions to address your concerns:

- Best meeting to date. Need to formulate new entry level ideas and make good decisions on sale of tags and vessel endorsements. A must to formulate permit for manatee zones.
- We got to the meat of the coconut. Feel that this meeting was the most productive yet. Look forward to the next one.
- I think these meetings are very good for the Blue Crab industry. Jeff Blair (facilitator) is the best person to help everybody understand these problems. I believe we are doing very good and are getting lots done. We still have things to do and I believe we are getting there.
- Please keep Jeff and Hal as our advisors.